



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/658,612	09/08/2000	Lester D. Nelson	FXPL-01027US0 MCF/KJD	3385
23910	7590	01/30/2004	EXAMINER	
FLIESLER MEYER, LLP FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER SUITE 400 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111			BARNIE, REXFORD N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2643	10

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/658,612

Applicant(s)

NELSON ET AL.

Examiner
REXFORD BARNIE

Art Unit
2643



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 3, 2003
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

REXFORD BARNIE

PRIMARY EXAMINER

01/21/04

Art Unit: 2643

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Katz (US Pat# 4,834,551).

Regarding claim 1, Katz teaches a call holding alerting system with a mechanical device (activate/deactivate switch of fig. 1 @ 12), a memory which forms part of means (24 or 16 of fig. 1) and a control logic (14) which can place an ongoing conversation in a hold mode and generate a message which can be relayed to a remote listener.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

Art Unit: 2643

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 2-3 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katz in view of Inoue et al. (US Pat# 6,332,024) or Cannon et al. (US Pat# 6,393,272).

Regarding claim 2, Katz fails to teach the claimed subject matter in detail even though he teaches activation of a switch means.

Inoue teaches a portable terminal wherein a button can be activated to send a hold message to a remote party in (see col. 14 lines 59-64).

Cannon teaches a wireless answer and hold feature wherein activation of a button causes a message to be sent to a remote party during an on-going call.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of either Cannon or Inoue into that of Katz thus making it possible to activate a message which can be sent to alert a user of an ongoing communication status.

Regarding claim 3, the combination teaches an audio generator.

Regarding claims 5-6, The examiner takes official notice that it's well known to use a headset or headphone in conjunction with a telephone including mobile phones and also, phones have handset or earpieces with speakers.

Art Unit: 2643

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katz in view of Grossman (US Pat# 6,122,346) or Saito (US Pat# 6,526,263).

Regarding claim 4, Katz fails to teach coupling a processor to an impedance matching circuit as taught by Saito who teaches a radio telephone with an impedance matching circuit in conjunction with a control circuit in (see figs.).

Grossman teaches a telephone on hold response system with appropriate impedance in (see col. 4 lines 13-19).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of (Grossman or Saito) into that of Katz thus making it possible to reduce noise, enhance sound intelligibility and to reduce transmission loss.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to REXFORD BARNIE whose telephone number is (703) 306-2744. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 to 6:00p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz, can be reached on (703) 305-4708.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to (703) 872-9314 and labeled accordingly (Please label

"PROPOSED/INFORMAL" or "FORMAL").

Art Unit: 2643

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Rexford Barnie
Patent Examiner
01/21/04

RBarnie
REXFORD BARNIE
PRIMARY EXAMINER